

# THE JEFFERSONIAN

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture, Science, Morality, and General Intelligence.

VOL 19.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. AUGUST 30, 1860.

NO. 33.

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum in advance.—Two dollars and a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. No papers discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the Editor.

Advertisements of one square (ten lines) or less, one or three insertions, \$1.00. Each additional insertion, 25 cents. Longer ones on proportion.

## JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, plain and ornamental type, we are prepared to execute every description of

## FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, Justices, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c., printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms at this office.

## THE REPUBLICANS OF MICHIGAN.

### SPEECH OF GOV. CHASE.

A meeting of five or six thousand Republicans occurred at Pontiac, Mich., on Wednesday. The following is the speech made on this occasion by Governor Chase of Ohio:

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF MICHIGAN.—I come before you through the very partial introduction of the chairman of your committee, but not altogether as a stranger. But I feel that we of Ohio and you of Michigan are of the same family; that we have the same great principles. We have derived them from the Ordinance of '37, which lies at the base of your institutions as it does of ours. What would have been your condition but for that ordinance? Chains and slavery where now are liberty, prosperity and all the institutions of civilized society. They tell us that we are free because we choose to be free. But I tell you that when we came here we came upon a soil that had been, before we came here, rendered incapable of being diverted from the benign influence of freedom. So that you of Michigan, and we of Ohio, have derived our free institutions from a common origin. Thus, when I look upon you, I feel that we belong to the same family; and that I am indeed not altogether a stranger, but am really among "our folks."

I come not to make a set or formal speech, but to attempt a very plain and simple statement of the question at issue before the country. It is a strange thing that we have four political parties—three of them having no chance to get any electoral votes in the Free States—the Douglas party, with two sets of principles for different sides of the river. But our noble Republican party, that has no two sets of principles for the two sides of the river, are arrayed, in the Free States, mainly against the Douglas party. I say that we and the Douglas wing of the Democratic party divide the Free States. We don't expect to get many votes for Mr. Lincoln in the Slave States. Why, they don't know enough yet. I remember a negro man who was coming through our State by the underground railroad that has an outlet at the upper end. Somebody asked him if he had seen Gov. Chase. "Oh," said he, "that big Abolitionist that eats poor niggers!"

I was once at Frankfort. Gen. Combs said, "I understand you have negroes for breakfast every morning." I told him I not only had them for breakfast, but for dinner and supper too. They really don't know about us yet. They don't understand that we shall treat them as members of the same confederacy, guarding all their rights. If they did, we should have tens of thousands of votes in the Slave States.

Well, Mr. Douglas is, at this moment so distrustful at the South, that he cannot achieve any electoral success, unless in Missouri, and there, if so, through division of his opponents. Now, if he cannot—although he has done so much for Slavery—what does it mean? There is no demand that Slavery has ever made that he has not yielded. He has denounced the ordinance of '37, and repealed the Missouri Compromise. Then he asks them—"Why won't you support me?" They turn around and reply—"Why Mr. Douglas, did you ever understand that we paid wages? Work without wages is our motto. There is one point in which you differ. We do not propose to allow you to differ from us in one point. We are inflexible; if you presume to differ with us we will rally and beat you." The result is, Mr. Douglas comes to the North and asks the North to support him. The question is between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Lincoln. You may go into Congress and you will find six out of seven Democratic Congressmen for Breckinridge; in the Senate, thirty-five for Breckinridge, and just two for Douglas, one of these Douglas himself, and the other, Pugh, of our State, to the 4th of March next. And when Lincoln is inaugurated, the only mourner over Mr. Douglas in the Senate will be Mr. Douglas himself. The only Democracy is the Breckinridge party; I mean, so far as it gives votes and sends men to Congress. The votes of this country will be divided between Mr. Breckinridge on the one side, and Lincoln on the other. This proves that the people are settling the question of Slavery.—There is no other question that divides them. Breckinridge's supporters take a plain and unequivocal position. They say that the Constitution of the United States, made by our fathers, was made for the purpose of spreading Slavery over every foot of Territory.

They say unequivocally in their platform that the Constitution takes Slavery into every foot of Territory which has not been protected by State Constitutions.—That if Freemen have gone into a territory and established free society a slaveholder may take his slaves there and hold

them against the consent and wishes of the people. Now that is intolerable.—We absolutely reject it. Nobody in the North holds this except a few Hunkers.

What is the Lincoln position? The doctrine proclaimed at Chicago was the exact opposite. Our friends at Chicago say that no individual or combination of individuals, have the power to introduce Slavery into a territory now free.

To reduce it to the shortest form, the Breckinridge party say there can be no freedom outside of a State.

The Republicans meet this and say there can be no Slavery outside of a Slave State—where it has been positively established.

It all turns upon the true meaning of the Constitution of the United States.—If it is the Constitution for Slavery, the Breckinridge party are right. If it means that it was as it says, to establish liberty, then the Republicans are right.

Well, fellow-citizens, where is the Douglas party? If you take it by its platform you can understand it very well. If you take it by its candidate you can understand it very well. If you take it by the declarations of Douglas you can understand it very well. But it is not where the great mass of the Democratic voters think it is. I was one of the Democrats, and I know the feelings of the Democracy, and I do not think they really want Slavery extended.

It became my duty as a United States Senator to oppose the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. It was advocated on precisely opposite grounds. One side held that the Constitution took Slavery into the Territories. Gen. Cass and Stuart held that it could not. I do not know what Stuart thinks, but I understand that since the Dred Scott decision my venerable and excellent friend, Gen. Cass, now thinks that it does.

But these Democrats, after the repeal, went through the Free States and proclaimed that this repeal would secure the Territories to Freedom. There is a large proportion of Douglas Democrats who believe to-day that by this principle of Squatter Sovereignty the Territories would be pre-empted to Freedom. Nor am I prepared to say that if you had a true principle of Popular Sovereignty, such would not be the case. That is to say, if Congress and the President would not interfere at all—but leave it to the settlers—there would be no Slavery.

But the Douglas party have no such thing as a genuine Popular Sovereignty in their creed.

Now let us inquire what Popular Sovereignty implies. In the first place, it seems to me you must have a people every one of whom is free. But, not to press that point, you have certainly got to have a people who have the power of legislation—of making their laws—of choosing their own officers, their own judiciary.

In the next place, you must have a people who organized their own institutions. Didn't you choose certain persons to go to Convention, who submitted the Constitution framed by them for your rejection or approval? There are these four things: 1. Organize the Government. 2. Choose the Legislature. 3. Choose the Executive; and 4th. Choose your own Judiciary.

Now, is any one of these in the Kansas Nebraska bill? I want my Douglas friends to consider whether they have any real Popular Sovereignty—whether they are building on the sand, or on the rock. These are no new ideas. When I was in the Senate I urged these same objections.

Who organized the Territorial Government? Why, the Committee on Territories at Washington City, of which Douglas was Chairman, organized it. Who voted on the law? Who made it? Why my friends, Mr. Douglas made it. And he is so great a Popular Sovereign that he can, as Chairman, organize Governments for the whole country? I tell you that the people, under the Kansas Nebraska bill, have nothing to do with organizing their own Government. In the next place, do the people of Kansas choose their legislators? Why, the Federal Government tells them they may choose certain persons—but the Federal Government tells how long and where they must sit. The people neither pay nor control the legislators. If Ohio should tell you to choose legislators, but say we will pay them if we choose, when they shall sit, and how long, what sort of Popular Sovereignty would that be? I tell you we should have another war; and it would be a worse one than the Toledo war. This Kansas-Nebraska act vests the power of legislation—where? In the men elected by the people? No. In so many words it says in the Governor and the Legislature. The Governor! That is a very important item. He can forbid any law being passed unless passed by a two-third vote. So the Governor has as much power as two thirds of the men elected by the people. But who is this Governor? He is appointed by the President. Suppose—to illustrate by Ohio, but we have no notion of interfering—suppose we in Ohio should appoint your Governor.—They wouldn't be likely to appoint my good friend Gov. Winser—perhaps they would appoint Sam Medary. Would you like it? Probably we should have another war. You would say, "We did not have the privilege of organizing our own Government, and now we can't elect our own Governor." You wouldn't stand it.

The people of Kansas would never have appointed Shannon or any of their

Pro-Slavery Governors. The Governor is appointed by the President, and the Governor has a veto; unless a law is passed by a two-thirds vote. Here is no Popular Sovereignty.

How is it with regard to the Judiciary? The people cannot choose their own judges. And this is very important. If the people cannot control and call them to account, it will be under the power that created it, or become very corrupt. They are appointed by the President, and they adjudicate all the rights of the citizens between themselves and between them and the General Government. Under this system you have no power, and yet you Douglas Democrats call it the establishment of Popular Sovereignty. The prohibition—which had stood, with the pledge to maintain it—that prohibition was annulled. Now, what did you get for that? Did you get Popular Sovereignty? No, you got Presidential intervention for Slavery. I appeal to you, what have you had but Presidential intervention? Didn't Pierce interfere?—Of course he did. He did nothing else but interfere. He acted as if there was, as Gov. Geary declared that there was, an understanding that Kansas should become a slave State, and Nebraska only dedicated to freedom. I know not how that was—Geary says it was so; but I do know they held their caucuses every morning in secret. The Democrats got tired of him because they did not like his policy on slavery. And then they got Mr. Buchanan; and they thought they'd got somebody. But what did they get? He followed in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor, only that he made every track longer and broader. If Pierce scourged freedom with whips, Buchanan has scourged her with scorpions. Now none so poor as to do him reverence. Mr. B. is thoroughly Pro-Slavery—that's it. The fact is, there is no Democratic heart but beats warm for freedom. The Democratic heart don't beat for slavery.

And now, my Democratic friends tell me, "Oh! he's an old Federalist." Well didn't I tell you so? I went about Ohio and they said they had a real Democrat. And the same gentlemen say they are mistaken; and they ought to be mistaken.—And they are going to be mistaken again if they expect to get any Popular Sovereignty out of Douglas. I concede his abilities as cheerfully as any man in the country. We are as wide apart as the poles. He follows the false light of despotism; I follow the light of freedom.

Mr. Douglas and I were then together. We were Democrats. In my opinion the prohibition was not inconsistent with freedom. Were you not Popular Sovereigns because you came here and found a land dedicated to freedom? If there had been roads and canals made for you by Congress, would you not have been free, because you had not made them yourselves? I know there is no unconstitutional provision in such prohibition. But when I knew there was a fixed purpose of Douglas and his confederates in this Nebraska bill to repeal this prohibition, I endeavored to secure a true Popular Sovereignty in that bill. Now, I rejoice to know that there is a Popular Sovereignty which governs Governors and Legislators, judges and Juries, and as Mr. Buchanan will find, presides over Presidents. Well, when Mr. Douglas proposed to repeal this prohibition, the first bill contained this provision—that all questions of slavery should be settled by the people through their appropriate representatives. But certain Southern Whigs said they were not going to let the Democrats of the South have this advantage—they were going to have a repeal direct. They told me so. And Mr. Dixon of Kentucky introduced such a repeal. Then Douglas asked that it be referred back. And he brought in the bill to repeal, and the provision to submit to the choice of the people was struck out. It declared the Missouri prohibition was superseded by the Compromise legislation in 1850. It was not true that the Compromise measures superseded this prohibition, and I moved to strike out that declaration; and Mr. Stuart said it was not true in law or fact, and Gen. Cass said it was entire fallacy. But Mr. Douglas and his friends voted not to strike out, and my motion was not carried. But this would not do—and they caucused it over, and then Mr. Douglas himself moved to strike it out, and then it passed very easily.—And then he inserted that clause that no stands in the bill—as Benton expressed it, "a stump speech injected in the belly of the bill."

Now what was meant by that beautiful phrase, "subject to the Constitution?" It was like the cat under the meal. What was under this? The Constitution had been extended to the territories, and the Constitution was to carry slavery with it. I said, "you mean to say to the South, you can go home and tell your people that their interpretation is to be effectual—that the people of a territory have no power to interfere with slavery, while here in the North we have Democratic orators who said it was the most harmless provision in the world," and to test it, I moved to add, "under which the people of the territory may, through their representatives, exclude slavery, if they choose."—Now who voted for this? Every man who is now a Republican; one or two Democrats. Norris and shield were the only ones. Who voted against it?—Mr. Douglas and his whole band of confederates. Mr. Douglas recently made a

speech and undertook to give a reason why he voted against that proposition.—He said it was not in the alternate; that it only gave power to exclude, and not also to admit, was the reason! The Senate was then divided thus: There was a party in the Senate who claimed that a territory could not exclude slavery. Some at the North held that a territory cannot enslave anybody. Now, between these two, it surely would be lost. I put it in that form. It was fully discussed. I told the gentlemen if they wanted it in the alternate, that all they had to do was to make an amendment to that effect.

But I think Mr. Douglas has forgotten. He had excluded that clause. I moved to insert that clause, and he voted against it. Now he claims that he voted against it because it was not in the alternate. If that was his reason, why did he strike it out? Why did he not consent to insert the part that I proposed to insert, and then move to add the other?

The truth is, they intended to put the power in the hands of the President.

I moved to allow the people to elect their own Governor. Who voted for it? I moved that the people elect their own, legislators and other officers. Who voted for it?

What was their excuse? Why, that the Governor and Secretary, &c., were Federal officers. That was just what I didn't want. When the chief officers were not accountable to the people there was no Popular Sovereignty.

How can these Douglas Democrats be deceived, when their chief turns them over, bound hand and foot, to the President, and then says, "See this illustration of my principle."—The President intervenes for Slavery. Federal power controls the Territories instead of the people—apples of Sodom, instead of the tree of life!

Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, in a recent speech, says what I didn't know before—what was the understanding. I knew that they had their caucuses.—There were Southern men of all complexions—I mean political complexions.—What was the object? That you Northern men might be robbed of your inheritance of freedom.

Mr. Benjamin tells us that they agreed in that convolute, that they would put the repeal on equivocal grounds, that could be represented one way at the North, and another way at the South, that equivocation was the plan. That the question was to be left to the Supreme Court, and that each party was to acquiesce in that decision. They were to put this repeal in such a position that the question should be referred to the Court, and which ever party lost should acquiesce.

Now, this was a very easy thing. Mr. Douglas says, "I have one idea." Mr. Benjamin says, "I have a different one." They agree to leave it to the Company. They acquiesce—they not merely yield, but they change their minds, and say they believed what they did not.

This railroad company doubtless has very worthy officers. Now a farmer has a controversy with the company, and he brings a suit. The first thing he finds the President of the company on the bench as Judge. "This is blue," he thinks, "but the Jury are the palladium of our rights. I can trust them." But he finds the foreman is an officer of the railroad, and so are nine out of the twelve. What sort of a chance has he? This is like the Benjamin and Douglas contract. Who are the Supreme Court? There are five slaveholders. How many slaveholders? Why four. How many of these four for freedom? One only—Judge McLean. Every other man concurred in Dred Scott.

Calhoun and the slaveholders were wise enough to see, many years ago, that there was a question as to the interpretation of the Constitution, and they have continued to get the control, until, by the arrangements of the Circuits, they have got five representing the Slave Power, and they have so managed that they have got three out of the other four. They have the president of the railroad and nine of the jurymen. So Mr. Benjamin thought he was safe.

What do you think of this, you Douglas Democrats? Do you believe in having your political principles traded away by the Supreme Court? If so, you are not Jackson Democrats. Then the principle was, "No power short of the Almighty can take away our political rights."

You talk about Liberty and Popular Sovereignty, and tell me that you have mortgaged your conscience to a slaveholding Court. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. More than two-thirds of the free people of the United States live in the Free States. Well, then, two-thirds of the Judges should be in the Free States; but they have so managed that they have five-ninths of them in the Slave States. Anybody knows that this is not right.

Despotic power is always aggressive—obtains a concession here, and another there.

This question, then, was left to the Supreme Court, and they decided that Popular Sovereignty was a sham, that the people of a Territory had no power to prohibit Slavery, and that they could not empower the people to prohibit it.

Douglas admits that they have decided that the slaveholder may take his slave and hold him there as other property.—A man who admits that is not far from admitting all. That I may take my fellow-man and hold him precisely as I

may my horse!

God gave man the charter to have dominion over the beasts of the field; but whence the charter to enslave your fellow-man and put him on common footing with the beasts of the field? There is the physical power, but not the right. And yet, we see people who think the slave just the same kind of property as any other. Why, a minister, a doctor, said to me once—"Governor Chase, if I can take me horse to Kansas, why not my brother in South Carolina take his slave?" What is the difference? I said, "My dear Doctor, I don't know that I can tell the difference, unless it be that a man is not a horse." There are few such doctors in the Methodist Church.

Now Douglas holds that a man has the same qualification as to the right of property in him as a horse. He does not care whether a man is a man or a horse; he don't care whether Slavery is voted up or voted down.

At Baltimore a portion of the Convention wanted the Cincinnati platform, pure and simple—and that's Pro-Slavery enough—but they would not go any further. They declared they would not go any further. And I rather doubted whether they would stand even there; for it is very hard to stand still when you are on a slippery hill-side. These gentlemen talked so at Baltimore, when they nominated Pierce; but then they made up their minds to slide. And I was afraid they would do so this time. Now Mr. Wickliffe got up and proposed this resolution:

"Resolved, That it is in accordance with the Cincinnati Platform, that during the existence of Territorial Governments the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution, on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been or shall hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and ability by every branch of the General Government."

Who seconds that? Why, the very man in Ohio who was a candidate against me for Governor. Well, Mr. Payne seconded this resolution, and it was passed without a dissenting vote in Mr. Douglas's Convention. Then Mr. Douglas wrote his letter accepting the nomination and the platform, referring to this clause and endorsing it. Now, where is your Popular Sovereignty? Why, it was dead long ago. It is now worse than dead, but it is not right exactly to say so.

He has now crowned the whole by saying that he gives this whole thing over to the Supreme Court, and they may decide that a Territory cannot exclude Slavery, and he will use the whole power of the Government to make the decree effectual. You cannot shut your eyes upon these things.

There is no Popular Sovereignty, for which you Douglas Democrats are fighting. If you want a Popular Sovereignty, come among the Republicans. If you want this country free from Slavery, open to enterprise in all its Territories, then vote for those who will preserve it to Liberty.

I am no candidate for office. But, speaking to you, Republicans, I wish to help you to understand the great principles on which you stand; and, to you, Democrats, that you may understand the true issue. I had rather help you to secure this great reform than hold any office.

It seems to me I have stated the true question—whether the Constitution is one for Slavery or Freedom. Be for freedom or despotism. Take one side or the other. I ask all to take their place. I ask the young men—where does your generous, earnest and noble instinct lead you? Have you any earnest throbbing here (in the heart) that leads you to choose that despotism should be established? When I was a young man, the thing that moved me most was a desire to contribute to the perpetuation of these blessings of freedom.

I ask you to take sides and decide where you will be. "If the Lord be God, then serve him; but if Baal, then serve him." If Slavery is right—if capital ought to own labor, then go for the doctrine openly. If you believe that freedom is the right of man, then join the party which has inscribed on the folds of its banner, "Freedom, throughout the country's wide domains."

The Douglas party dare not publish the speeches of their candidate for the Vice Presidency, nor of their man Gaudin, who said non-intervention meant the right of every man to hold as many niggers as held a mind to. But such are the doctrines South, and they don't dare to publish them here at the North.

I know that some imagine that there is some hostility to Popular Sovereignty in the Republican party, and therefore, they propose to vote for Mr. Douglas. But I ask you to look at these questions for yourself.

We in Ohio intend to do our part toward electing Abraham Lincoln. We do it because we have confidence in him. He will never make any such campaign as Mr. Benjamin tells us of. But as Ethan Allen took possession of Ticonderoga in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress, so Abraham Lincoln will say, in effect, "I come to take

possession of this Government in the name of the great Jehovah and the people of the United States, and I intend to administer it for the good of the whole people." That is right, that is noble. I ask you here, in Michigan, not only that Lincoln has your vote, but that every member of Congress is with him. If you Republicans go to sleep, it may be that they will steal a march on you in this matter of Congressmen.

The Canvass—A Bar-room Dialogue—Attempt at Fusion—A Fireup in New Jersey.

Correspondence of the Tribune.

Philadelphia, Aug. 21, 1860.

This city is rapidly becoming a political hive, and without drones at that. In spite of the sultry evenings, the working bees cluster in and around the various headquarters of the People's party with furor of enthusiasm unknown before so early in the campaign. The drill, moreover, is so complete, the Wide-Awakes, the Continentals, and other bodies of young men so admirably-organized, and so powerful in numbers, that the great hive throws them off in swarms into all the neighboring towns, over in New Jersey, down even into Delaware and Maryland, to take part in and add to the interest of all local demonstrations outside of the city. (On these occasions a complete and hearty fraternization takes place. The Wide-Awakes electrify the dull community into which they precipitate themselves, and stimulate kindred organizations for the common cause. Last week 800 of these active young Lincoln men went down to Wilmington as adjuncts of a great oratorical jubilee.—Though not frightening the town from its propriety, yet they made a huge sensation. While parading the streets, the Breckinridgers threw stones and hooted at them, but they made short work of this hostile demonstration, left the ranks on the instant, collared the disturbers, shook some, flogged others, and would have licked the entire party had they not quickly taken to their heels. This whole Wide-Awake idea is a most important one for a city like ours, where cheating at the polls has been carried on so shamelessly. They will hereafter constitute an army of vigilantes in each precinct, and make it a dangerous business to offer forged naturalization papers. Symptoms of the old game are already observable in the 1st District. The number of laborers in the Navy-Yard is increasing, and will continue to enlarge until the election is over. That passed there will be no more old ships to overhaul, no chips to pick up, no timber to shift from one place to another, no more Tom Florences in Congress.—William Montgomery has lost his nomination for the same body, the Republicans have dropped him for an out-and-out man of their own sort. Thaddeus Stevens is again taken up, and John Covode has consented to run again as a peace-maker between contending aspirants. Thus the House, while undergoing purgation of its unruly and disaffected Members, will retain those sturdy men who have never yet battled for anything but the right.

Three gentlemen from Illinois were stopping at a princely hotel last week, two of them from Springfield. At the same hotel were several Bell men from the interior of this State. The two parties encountered each other in the bar-room after dinner, and the Bell men learning whence the others came, seraped acquaintance with them after this fashion:—"I understand that you are from Illinois—from Springfield?"

"Yes, Sir, two of us, the other is from Egypt."

"Permit me to inquire if you know Abraham Lincoln? Is he an Abolitionist?"

"I will answer you, but I wish you to understand that we are both Democrats, and intend to vote for Douglas. We have known Abraham Lincoln for twenty years. He is not an Abolitionist, never was one, and I don't believe he ever will be. Does any one accuse him of it here? I have lived in the same town with him for years, and have but a single point of difference with him, and that is on politics."

"Yes, Sir, the Douglas papers accuse him of being an Abolitionist, and I was anxious to have it confirmed or contradicted by one whose opportunities of knowing are so good as yours."

"Sir," rejoined the other with great vehemence, "I will do Abraham Lincoln justice; it is a d—d lie!"

The whole company sailed at this outspoken honesty of a man who confessed himself a political opponent, for by this time a number of persons had gathered round, and were listening with great interest to the conversation. The Bell man continued:

"Do you consider, from your knowledge of Mr. Lincoln, that he is qualified to fill the office of President?"

"Qualified, Sir!—why, none but a fool or a knave would dare to doubt it. If Lincoln is not fit to be President this Government may get ready to shut up shop."

"There is one other question I am anxious to put. Who, in your opinion, will Illinois vote for?"

"Sir, I told you honestly that we were all for Douglas, and I answer you with equal honesty that Illinois will go for Lincoln."

Here the Egyptian added: "And even what you Republicans call Egypt I fear has become insolated in the same way."